DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 796 EC 140 308

AUTHOR	Jackson, Elouise, Ed.; Karp, Joan M. A., Ed.
TITLE	Program Strategies for Cultural Diversity. Proceedings of the 1980 Minority Leadership Workshop: Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (June 22-25, 1980).
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Technical Assistance Development System.; Western States Technical Assistance Resource, Monmouth, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	300-77-0508
NOTE	82p.; For related documents, see EC 140 309-310.
AVAILABLE FROM	WESTAR, Western States Technical Assistance Resource, 345 N. Monmouth Ave., Monmouth, OR 97361 ($3.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Cultural Differences; *Disabilities; *Early Childhood Education; *Minority Groups; *Models; Multicultural Education; Organizational Communication; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Handicapped Childrens Early Education Program

ABSTRACT

The booklet contains proceedings of a conference for minority project administrators in the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP), a federal program to develop exemplary services for young handicapped children. Part 1 includes topical presentations reflecting the expressed interests of participants related to model programs. Chapters have the following titles and authors: "Trends in Cultural Pluralism and Assessment of Minority Group Children" (J. Wofford); "Planning and Implementing Program Evaluation" (P. Gandara); "Developing, Implementing, and Disseminating the Educational Model" (H. Hankerson); "Cultural Awareness--Working with Parents of Handicapped Children" (T. Brito); "Facilitating Communication--The Action Planning Approach" (B. Coppock, Jr.); and "Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies" (B. Ramirez and Y. Galiber). A list of recommended strategies for model development follows each chapter. Part 2 summarizes the content of two panel presentations dealing with minority involvement in professional organizations and federal program resources. A final section contains supplementary information regarding the Minority Leadership Consortium and the workshop itself--agenda, names and addresses of workshop resource persons, and the workshop evaluation report. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209796

Program Strategies for Cultural Diversity

June 22–25, 1980

Proceedings of the
1980 Minority
Leadership Workshop:
Handicapped Children's
Early Education Program

Edited by
Elouise Jackson
and Joan M. A. Karp
Produced by the Western States Technical Assistance Resource (WESTAR) and the Technical Assistance Development System (TADS)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marcia J. May

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WESTAR
Western States Technical
Assistance Resource
345 N. Monmouth Avenue
Monmouth, Oregon
97361

TADS
Technical Assistance
Development System
A Division of the Frank Porter Graham
Child Development Center
University of North Carolina
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
27514

EC 140308

Managing Editors:
Marcia J. May
& Gary Harrison

Word Processors:
Cheryl Yates
Jean Chatfield

Printed by:
Western States Technical Assistance Resource,
University of Washington, Seattle

1980

Reproduced and distributed under contract number 300-77-0508 from the Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii

Foreword, by David Rostetter ix

Introduction xi

PART 1 Topical Presentations and Strategies

Trends in Cultural Pluralism and Assessment of Minority Group Children, by Jean E. Wofford 3

Planning and Implementing Program Evaluation, by Patricia Gandara 9

Developing, Implementing, and Disseminating the Educational Model, by Henry E. Hankerson 19

Cultural Awareness: Working with Parents of Handicapped Children, by Teresa Brito 37

Facilitating Communication: The Action Planning Approach, by Bertram Coppock, Jr. 41

Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies, by Bruce Ramirez and Yetta W. Galiber 45

PART 2 Panel Presentations

Support for Services: Federal Programs and Resources for Funding 55

National Organizations: How to Get Involved 63

PART 3 Supplementary Information

Minority Leadership Consortium Membership 69

Minority Leadership Workshop Agenda 75

Minority Leadership Workshop Resource Persons 77

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several persons deserve special mention for their contributions to the 1980 HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop. Yuki Okuma and Michael Ortiz of the Minority Leadership Consortium Steering Committee provided valuable assistance in conceptualizing and planning the workshop, and in identifying resource persons. The responsiveness of the entire Minority Leadership Consortium in suggesting agenda topics and generating strategies is also appreciated.

David Rostetter, Ed Wilson, William Swan, and Ed Sontag of the Office of Special Education were significantly involved in the development of the workshop agenda and format. They and other OSE staff also served as resource persons during the workshop. Assisting the workshop coordinators, Joan Karp (WESTAR) and Elouise Jackson (TADS), were Pascal Trohanis of TADS and Joyce Jackson of WESTAR. In addition, the presenters, each of whom addressed the expressed needs of the participants, contributed greatly to the success of the workshop.

Marcia J. May and Gary Harrison of WESTAR served as managing editors and prepared the proceedings for publication.

FOREWORD

by David Rostetter

This proceedings document is one in a series of activities and products resulting from a spirit of cooperation among several groups with a common interest: an increase of quality services to young handicapped minority children and their families. A previous document, Issues of Common Concern, was the first formal step toward building a firm foundation in a three-year effort to recognize and deal with some of the unique and difficult problems confronting young minority children and their families. The foundation for this effort is the Minority Leadership Consortium, comprised of minority leaders who direct and coordinate local and state projects funded by the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program.

Several significant events have occurred in the year since the Consortium was formed. First, in response to the Consortium Steering Committee's proposal for fiscal support, the Office of Special Education awarded a service contract to International Business Services, Inc. Second, the two HCEEP Technical Assistance agencies, HCEEP staff in the Office of Special Education, and the Consortium cooperated in planning and conducting the 1980 workshop that resulted in this document. Its content reflects the commitment of these professionals to confront and develop solutions to the issues involved in providing quality services to minority children and their families. The document also reveals the tremendous potential of this collaborative effort to substantially influence the delivery of services to all children.

The future of this effort is now secure, with the continued interest of the Consortium, OSE staff, TADS, WESTAR, and the assistance of International Business Services. Other products and activities are forthcoming which will prove to be of great benefit to children and their families and the dedicated professionals who serve them.

INTRODUCTION

Program Strategies for Cultural Diversity is the proceedings of the 1980 HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop, held on June 22-25 in Arlington, Virginia. The workshop was the second sponsored by the Office of Special Education (U.S. Department of Education) for minority project administrators in the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP), a federal program to develop exemplary services for handicapped young children. The workshop was planned and conducted by the HCEEP technical assistance agencies (the Technical Assistance Development System and the Western States Technical Assistance Resource), with the cooperation of the HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium.

The Minority Leadership Consortium, comprised of HCEEP minority project directors and coordinators across the country (Part 3), was first conceived in the mid-'70s and formally organized as the result of a similar OSE-sponsored workshop held in May of 1979. The consortium determined as its purposes to create a nationally visible means through which minority leaders could address concerns related to the development of model service programs, and to encourage and support an increase of minority-directed programs within the HCEEP network. During the past year, since the first leadership workshop and the organization of the Consortium, this group has worked closely with OSE, TADS, and WESTAR to accomplish significant advances in minority leadership within the HCEEP network. The proceedings of the 1979 workshop, Issues of Common Concern, were published by the technical assistance agencies and distributed throughout HCEEP; the Consortium selected its own steering committee for leadership and representation with OSE and the early childhood/special education field; and the Consortium submitted a proposal requesting financial support of its activities to OSE. In response to the proposal, OSE awarded a contract to International Business Services, Inc. (IBS) in Washington, D.C., which is

now working together with the Consortium, the TA agencies, and OSE in support of the Consortium's goals. IBS activities will include developing materials specific to minority-directed and minority population programs, establishing a communications network among minority-directed projects and the early childhood/special education field, and providing other assistance to OSE and the Consortium.

The Minority Leadership Consortium was actively involved in the planning of the 1980 Minority Leadership Workshop, which proved to be an opportunity for the minority leaders to: (1) build and strengthen linkages among themselves related to the development of model programs for handicapped children, (2) recommend strategies for dealing with problems faced by minority project administrators, (3) communicate with the Minority Leadership Consortium about their activities and accomplishments, and (4) establish an organizational structure for the Minority Leadership Consortium in 1980-81.

The workshop planning committee was comprised of representatives from the Minority Consortium Steering Committee, OSE, TADS, and WESTAR. The first planning activity was the development of a survey to elicit topical areas and minority-specific issues to be addressed at the workshop. Three sources of input for the survey were evaluation data from the 1979 workshop, the results of previously conducted needs assessments by TADS and WESTAR, and the ideas and suggestions of the minority leaders themselves. Through the survey of all Consortium members, ten content areas related to model development and the field of early childhood/special education were identified; in addition, minority professionals were selected to be resource persons for the workshop. (See Part 3 for the workshop agenda and names of resource persons.) The resulting agenda provided for large group presentations, followed by small group sessions to discuss strategies related to the topic, and for panel presentations followed by question/answer sessions. The results of the participant evaluation of the workshop are included in Part 3.

This document is divided into three parts. The first includes the large group presentations, each followed by the recommended strategies generated by the participants as they related to minority program administration. The second part is a summary of the panel presentations given at the workshop; the third, a compendium of supplementary information regarding the Minority Leadership Consortium, the Resource Persons present at the conference, the agenda, and the workshop evaluation report.

In summary, the Minority Leadership Consortium is working to address issues important to maintaining a viable, cohesive organization. This workshop was an opportunity for the group to select new steering committee members, to

identify improved means of communicating with the membership, to move closer to the attainment of its goals, and to examine areas for future development.

Part 1

Topical Presentations and Strategies

Part 1 includes topical presentations reflecting the expressed interests of participants related to model programs. Each chapter is followed by strategies generated by the participants regarding the topical issues.

Trends in Cultural Pluralism and Assessment of Minority Group Children

Jean E. Wofford

Diversity among cultures is a normal social phenomenon. A key concern which faces minority groups in America is how, without being jeopardized, this diversity can be organized so that the individuals among variant subcultural groups can impress upon those of the majority culture that multicultural diversity is legitimate and enhancive.

By looking at the public education system, preschool through postsecondary school, one can see how the majority culture conventionally receives the idea of multicultural diversity. In their attempts to simplify the world, people continue to stereotype by grouping people together, disregarding individual uniqueness and cultural variety. Stereotyping, as discussed by Allport (1954) in his classic book on prejudice, is one of the common ways people manage their social lives. One major problem with stereotyping is that it ignores reality and destroys the possibility of learning from cultural and individual differences; thus, stereotyping has no place in education, in educational planning, or in educational assessment.

THE NEED FOR NONDISCRIMINATORY ASSESSMENT

Educational planning relies upon functional characteristics, that is, upon how children perform as determined by psychological, social, and physical conditions. Functional data are collected through assessment. The problem of assessment, however, is particularly vexed when applying instruments and procedures across diverse linguistic and cultural groups, for assessment instruments are not universally applicable across cultural groups, and those who

administer assessments do not always have the training, expertise, or cultural sensitivity to deal effectively with minority group populations. Furthermore, functional characteristics themselves can be perceived by others as simply sources for new stereotypes. A common frustration of diagnosticians is that functional data made available to educators are not always incorporated into educational planning; instead, the data often are used to create more stereotypes.

The problem is how to talk about cultures or subcultures without simply providing yet more sophisticated ways to distinguish the groups with more stereotypes. In a sense, what should be remembered is that when we talk about cultural differences, we talk about how we are like some people and unlike some other people. But there are two other levels operating here which apply to the individual: in some ways we are like no other person, but in other ways we are like all other people. Whatever we know about a group's shared characteristics, these other levels cannot be ignored.

Whatever culture a child is from, he or she is human, able to learn, to think, and to feel, and cultural differences are small compared to these similarities. However, in other ways a particular child is like no other, and knowing something about the particular culture from which the child comes does not excuse educators from their obligation and responsibility to know the child as an individual, unique from other individuals, and to respond to the child's special needs with an individualized plan of instruction. Educators are hindered in the development of Individualized Educational Programs because the majority of standardized assessment tools used to make decisions about minority group children do not recognize the validity of multiculturalism or polylingualism.

Assessment measures which have been standardized from a white middle-class population are inappropriate and invalid measures for determining or diagnosing behavioral conditions of minority group children, e.g., Native American, Black, Chicano. Given the complexities associated with the "testing movement" in America, many children are being misdiagnosed, mislabled, and thus mistreated. Priority appears to have shifted to meeting requirements of public laws and mandates with little regard given to the future of the children who are victims of reporting requirements and categories. It is unfortunate that services to children with special needs are contingent upon a label. Moreover, the children often wear the labels for life.

Examiners should be aware of the assessment tools in light of the normative data--culture, primary language,

sex, and social status. To ignore these factors only perpetuates failure among culturally different children. In addition, the attitudes and expectations of the examiners and the minority children are often divergent, and frequently cultural clash interferes so much with the assessment process that the children's cultural norms and interactional practices are violated. Some traits that may clash are language expectations, communication styles, learning styles, and behavioral repertoires. These points of conflict are often overlooked during the assessment process, and seldom are the children's protests or attempts to change the assessment situation taken into consideration, even though these give clues to what the children find intolerable, unsuitable, boring, or threatening. It must be remembered that the examiner's attitudes and expectations about specific groups, the environment in which the assessment is made, and the instruments used influence the responses of the children favorably or unfavorably.

COGNITIVE STYLE: RELATIONAL OR ANALYTICAL

Another area which has received much attention and is directly related to assessment procedures is the cognitive style of children--how children receive and process information. It has been postulated that cognitive styles are either predetermined by the nature of the organism, or that they are the result of idiosyncratic early experiences which have developed into learning pathways as the result of random trials in problem settings. In a series of studies on cognitive styles, Cohen (1968) investigated the generic requirements for pupil performance in school, the cognitive framework from which such requirements were derived, and the comparative language styles of low-income groups. These studies resulted in the identification of two mutually incompatible conceptual styles--relational and analytic. Each style is believed to affect a person's ability to select, organize, and process information.

The analytic style, often called stimulus-centered, is characterized by a formal or analytic mode of abstracting salient information from a stimulus; it is parts-specific, that is, parts or attributes of a given stimulus have meaning in themselves. The relational style, more commonly called self-centered, is characterized by a descriptive mode; it is called self-centered because only the global characteristics of a stimulus have meaning, and these only in reference to some total context.

Several measures were used to distinguish analytic and relational cognitive styles among children: standardized tests of intelligence and achievement, reading comprehension and language tests, psychological tests, observations, and interviews. In addition, many school-related learning characteristics, such as length and intensity of attention and preferences of optional reading material were used.

Since conceptual styles across racial and cultural groups have not been systematically explored, the author questions Cohen's (1969) findings that relational modes of cognitive organization are dominant among persons from low-income environments, while analytic modes are common in the middle class. While the research procedures used to define the two groups certainly affect the reliability and validity of these findings, there remains the need for further study into the cognitive styles and conceptualization processes of minority group children. The learning environments of most public and private educational programs are founded on an analytic ideology; that is, the psychological, social, academic, and linguistic requirements of the program are designed for "analytic" children. In general, the cognitive characteristics of the relational style and its socio-behavioral response patterns have been considered disruptive to the analytically oriented learning environment. Analytic and relational cognitive styles are so discordant that a minority child, whose preferred mode of cognitive organization is relational, is unlikely to be rewarded socially or academically in the analytic setting. A conflict evolves when the child's native abilities, background experiences and behavioral and informational repertoire appear inadequate or problematic. It is likely not the child, however, but the conflicting learning environment and teaching styles which are in fact inadequate.

IMPROVING SERVICES FOR MINORITY CHILDREN

The effective delivery of appropriate education services to minority group children is thus dependent upon several factors:

1. Improved attitudes and understanding of individual and cultural differences,
2. Increased awareness and sensitivity to these differences,

3. Active involvement of parents in decision making,
4. Viewing parents as contributing resources,
5. Coordinating and linking community services,
6. Improved observation and record keeping skills among educators,
7. Improved staff development and teacher preparation programs,
8. Understanding the comprehensive provisions of federal legislation and advances mandated by the courts which guarantee persons with handicapping conditions the right to an appropriate, free, public education and related services.

This paper has highlighted some trends in cultural pluralism and the assessment of minority group children and the need for increased sensitivity and awareness. Although attempts are being made to improve the quality of educational and related services equitably, traditional educational practices and attitudes are basically unchanged. Furthermore, because of the faulty design and inflexibility of many assessment instruments and the cultural insensitivity of many examiners, assessment data concerning minority children do not accurately reflect the actual learning abilities of those children. The data can be used to posit biological or psychological bases for learning problems which actually arise from the often disadvantageous interface between minority students and the educational assessment process. In order to remedy and to identify the real problems, we must institute an assessment process which is responsive to, and which encompasses the diversity among, the various cultural groups comprising our society.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. The nature of prejudice. New York: Doubleday, 1954.

Cohen, R. The language of the hard core poor: Implications for culture conflict. Sociology Quarterly, 1968, 10, 19-28.

Cohen, R. Conceptual styles, culture conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist, 1969, 71(5), 828-856.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR NONDISCRIMINATORY ASSESSMENT

GOAL: To implement less biased means of assessing minority preschool children.

To implement nondiscriminatory assessment procedures, project leaders can:

1. Observe the assessment process with new examiners; including the examiner's skills, the test, and the test administration.
2. Contact Child Find, located in predominantly minority locales, for listing of their assessment instruments.
3. Consult ERIC and Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE) for cross-listing of available publications and publishers of minority assessment tools.
4. Document local variables affecting the development of less biased instruments.
5. Encourage publishers to revise and standardize current instruments for use with minority populations.
6. Arrange for an informational conference on the selection and use of assessment instruments for minority handicapped children.
7. Take the first step to correct inappropriate assessment procedures by using criterion-referenced and functional evaluations for children which have more direct bearing on instructional strategies.
8. Select a competent assessor who shares and understands the child's culture and language and who is able to establish good rapport with and properly administer tests to minority handicapped children.

Planning and Implementing Program Evaluation

Patricia Gandara

The issue of developing evaluation designs which are both culturally relevant and culturally sensitive has never been given its deserved attention. Controversies have surrounded many of the major national evaluations which involved minority subjects, yet little effort has been made on the part of the research community as a whole to improve the sensitivity of its methods. A good case in point is much of the evaluation research which has been conducted on Head Start programs. A number of methodologically defensible studies have been done which were not necessarily relevant to the populations served or consistent with the goals considered important by the communities. Researchers who were busily measuring IQ point gains missed the message that parents were more interested in whether their children were having a positive schooling experience, than in their children's IQs. Those evaluations also often failed to take into account other important roles that Head Start played in the community.

THREE MAJOR QUESTIONS IN DEVELOPING AN EFFECTIVE DESIGN

In attempting to develop an evaluation design that is truly sensitive to the unique aspects of the community which a program serves, three major questions must be asked: (1) What is the purpose of the evaluation? (2) Does the evaluation design allow for an assessment of implementation? and (3) Do the proposed evaluation objectives match the program's goals? The discussion which follows will address each of these questions.

First, evaluation may serve many purposes. Through evaluation, a program's existence can be justified to the appropriate funding agencies which need to know if a program is doing what it set out to do. By showing whether or not the procedures which were outlined in the initial proposal were actually followed, evaluations help determine if a program was properly implemented. Evaluation makes it possible to assess what part of a program was most effective and to determine what kinds of changes could be made to improve it. Furthermore, through evaluation the suitability of a program for a particular population can be determined, and a synthesis of data provided from various evaluations will increase the body of knowledge about how certain educational processes function.

A single evaluation effort may include any number of goals. Once these goals are defined, however, it is possible to isolate who the primary audience(s) of the evaluation will be. Defining the audience is critical to any evaluation, since it will shape the methods used as well as the way results will be presented.

Second, the importance of including an implementation assessment in the evaluation design cannot be overemphasized. It does little good to know if a program was effective or not, if it is not known whether the prescribed procedures were, in fact, followed. If a new director was hired midway through the evaluation period and decided to make major changes in a program, its success or failure cannot be attributed to the original program plan. By knowing the degree to which a program was implemented, an evaluator can attribute the results of the evaluation either to the procedures which were outlined in the original proposal or to other factors. An evaluation of implementation need not be elaborate; it may consist of only a detailed checklist of activities and procedures. As many staff members as possible, however, should participate in this phase of the evaluation, and under no circumstances should it be overlooked.

Third, whether or not the proposed evaluation objectives match a program's goals can only be determined by systematically identifying the goals and comparing them against the objectives of the evaluation design or plan. It is important not only that the program goals be listed as they were laid out in the funding proposal, but also that any changes which may have occurred in program goals since the proposal was written be noted. When the program goals are laid side by side with the design objectives, they should match. Thus, if the objective of a program is to increase English language reading skills in a group of bilingual students, the design objectives should include a measurement of reading level in English. They should <u>not</u>

include a measurement of Spanish reading ability, unless there is reason to believe that this ability would be affected by English instruction. The design objectives also should not include a test of concept development.

Once a congruence between program goals and evaluation design objectives has been established, and assuming that the staff has already grappled with the problem of making the program relevant to the population it is serving, the evaluation team must assess whether the design provides for a culturally sensitive evaluation of the program goals. Two major considerations are: methods and measures.

EVALUATION METHODS AND MEASURES

It is important to remember in designing a program evaluation that such design requires a complete shift of mental set from the specific to the general. Methods and measures which are appropriate for individuals may not be appropriate for an evaluation, and vice versa.

The methods used will depend largely on the goals of the evaluation and its primary audience; they will also depend on the resources available to carry out the evaluation. A good evaluation need not be extremely complex, but it must be carefully planned. Obviously, the more comprehensive the evaluation, the more the evaluation will cost. Conscientious evaluators are always caught in the struggle between doing a thorough evaluation and doing one that fits within their budget constraints. Usually a compromise must be reached.

Some important concerns with respect to methods used in minority programs are: Who will collect the data? and How will the data collection take place? There is some evidence which suggests that both the method used in gathering information from subjects and the racial or ethnic background of the tester or interviewer are important variables which may affect the outcome of the data. In order to minimize the possible effects of these variables, the feasibility of using data collectors who at least are familiar with the cultural backgrounds of the subjects, who preferably share the same cultural background, and who speak the primary language of the subjects should be considered. These individuals should also be trained in the data-collection procedures used, and part of their training should focus on culture-specific issues--for example, what kinds of questions are likely to pose a problem for this particular group and how data collectors need to present

certain material so that no misunderstandings occur between themselves and the subjects.

Figure 1 presents an efficient means for looking at current methods of evaluation. The figure represents both quantitative and qualitative methods which measure outcomes (the effects of a program at its completion), and process the effects of a program throughout its implementation). It is possible to use a number of methods to look at a single variable, a single method to look at a number of variables, or a combination of methods and variables. The decision will probably be based in good part on the financial resources available to each program as well as on the appropriateness of various methodologies and the amount and kind of information desired and needed.

Pretesting/Posttesting (upper left quadrant) is an example of the classic methodology for looking at program outcomes. Data on some variable(s) are collected at the beginning of the program, then again at the end of the "treatment period." In this way the evaluator can assess change from entry to exit time. If comparison or control groups are used, the evaluator may be able to judge if a significant portion of the change is actually due to the treatment, in this case, the program. In evaluation research, this kind of design enjoys a considerable amount of credibility. However, it also has a number of shortcomings, some of which are especially important to consider when evaluating minority programs.

FIGURE 1

Four Methods of Evaluation

Type of Data	Type of Evaluation	
	Outcome	Process
Quantitative	Pretest/Posttest	Observation Rating Scale
Qualitative	Preobservation/ Postobservation	Ethnography, interview

A typical problem in pretesting and posttesting is insufficient time. The end of the treatment period does not necessarily signal the end of the impact of the program.

The real impact may be felt later, or conversely, an effect at the end of the program may "wash out" a short time later. In addition, although this method describes whether or not a program produced gains in its participants, it does not describe how or which aspects were most effective. Hence, the data collected do not help improve the methods of the people who work in the program, for the data do not show why a program either succeeds or fails. Another shortcoming of pretesting/posttesting is that it does not provide any information about changes in the treatment plan which frequently take place during the course of its administration, nor does it address the question of level of implementation, which, therefore, must take place separately.

Finally, because the tests themselves are often intrusive and unnatural, the evaluation itself may cause artifacts in the data. Children, especially handicapped and minority children, are often tested in unnatural settings, etc. The tests are also highly dependent on the quality of the measures, a serious problem, to be discussed later. Because of these shortcomings, pretesting/posttesting is best used to provide justification of program to funding agency.

Observation Rating Scales (upper right quadrant) offer an evaluation methodology which allows data to be collected in context in such a way that they may still be quantified. Thus, comparisons and summative statements about the program, (e.g., positive interactions between children) may still be made. Beyond producing quantifiable data, Observation Rating Scales avoid the problems of tests and instruments, provide more natural data, and allow for built-in implementation assessment.

The disadvantages with Observation Rating Scales are that interrater reliabilities are extremely hard to get, and the observer can be intrusive and artificial, thus creating data artifacts. Furthermore, rating scales reduce rich qualitative information to numbers which sometimes obscure what is actually happening. A final disadvantage is that these scales are costly and should be used randomly at intervals. Thus, the best use for Observation Rating scales is to evaluate in-house staff development for funding agencies where tests are inappropriate or inadequate.

Preobservation/Postobservation techniques (lower left quadrant) allow an evaluator to retain rich observational data and still make a summative statement about a program. This method also avoids the problems of instrumentation and is less costly than the process-oriented evaluation for it requires data collection at only two points. Nevertheless, as with all qualitative data, there is a good amount of subjectivity which often lacks credibility, and although a summative statement can be made, it is difficult to make

comparisons. Furthermore, like pretesting/posttesting, this kind of observation method does not explain what happens between entry and exit points. This method is best used in combination with pretesting/posttesting in order to provide descriptive data which make the evaluation richer. Observation can present important information lost in tests and bring out successes that are not recorded in pretesting/posttesting.

Ethnography and interview (lower right quadrant) produce very rich data which can bring a program to life and promote an understanding of what really happens and how. However, on their own, ethnography and interview techniques too have serious disadvantages. The primary disadvantage is subjectivity; hence, data are non-quantitative, nonsummative, and do not facilitate comparisons. Moreover, the interview can be intrusive; the interview also can be costly, because of difficulty in managing data.

Ethnography and interview methods, then, are best used to add to the body of knowledge in the field and to provide information about how a program works for in-house purposes; they also provide strategies for collecting implementation data.

The most important and frequently the most controversial aspect of evaluation is determining the measures to be used. A measure can be anything that is used to collect data; it may be a test, a questionnaire, an interview, or a number of other things. In most evaluations of educational programs serving children, it is a test. When tests are used with minority children there is, and rightly so, almost always reason for concern. However, it is critically important to keep in mind the important distinction between tests which are used to evaluate individual children and tests which are used to evaluate effects of programs on groups of children. The same test may be used in both ways. However, a test which may be totally inadequate to do the former may be the best choice to accomplish the latter.

Since the validity of an evaluation often rides on the appropriateness and the soundness of the measures or instruments used, it is imperative that a thorough examination of the instruments be made before committing to their use and that careful training for their administration be incorporated into data-collection procedures. If there is a third-party evaluator, training and self-examination are especially important. Key questions to ask during the examination are:

1. Are the measurement items culturally appropriate?
2. Is the language of the instrument such that it will be easily interpreted by the subjects? Are translations needed?

3. Has the instrument been used in evaluations like this before? If not, has it been piloted on a sample similar to the present one? What is its record?
4. What is the instrument's face validity? How does it look?

Finally, if an evaluation is being performed in order to justify program funding, a third-party evaluation should be considered. The third-party evaluator not only lends credibility to the evaluation, but also is often able to provide a perspective on the evaluation that would be impossible to achieve by the individuals who are already involved in the program. On the other hand, third-party evaluators are not always sensitive to important aspects of a program, and a common criticism of such evaluations is that they miss the real point of the program or attempt to measure the wrong variables. In order to get around this problem, two specific strategies should be considered.

First, there should be a coordinated or cooperative effort on the part of the evaluator and the program directors. In a cooperative third-party evaluation, the evaluator has the final word with respect to the design, methods, and measures, but he or she makes frequent checks with the program staff to ensure that, as the design develops, both parties are in agreement in these areas. A second strategy involves developing a smaller scale complementary or supplementary evaluation that is carried out by program staff. This, of course, requires extra time and money, but can be justified from the perspective that such an in-house evaluation can help make better sense of the third-party evaluator's results and better use of his or her findings. This in-house evaluation should include an evaluation of implementation.

Developing culturally relevant evaluation designs, then, involves not only defining the purpose of the evaluation, assessing its implementation, and aligning the evaluation objectives with the program's goals, but also ensuring that measures used are appropriate to the target population and that evaluators are informed about the goals and objectives of minority programs. Therefore, evaluation methods must be selected or designed carefully to ensure that they are in accordance with the goals of the evaluation and its primary audience. Only through these means can programs administer evaluations which are relevant and culturally sensitive to the minority populations which they serve.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

GOAL: To identify ways to evaluate HCEEP programs which are sensitive to the interaction of handicapping conditions with minority group status.

To evaluate programs, project leaders can:

1. Identify appropriate third-party evaluations by examining his or her previous project evaluations, JDRP record, and interest in handicapped minority children.
2. Include funds for evaluation as line items in budget.
3. Seek from OSE or the TA agencies a listing of instruments, data collection and recording instruments and formats acceptable for JDRP.
4. Include ethnographic study within evaluation design for minority programs.
5. Make the decision early in program development if JDRP is a goal, because of the JDRP data requirements.
6. Use informal assessments in light of the following modifications:
   a. adopt materials and items which are familiar to children
   b. use parent input for modification
   c. observe environmental setting of the children (home as well as school)
   d. use pre- and inservice training to establish test examination procedures which are culturally sensitive
   e. consider reexamination of the children periodically, even if examiner represents the same ethnic/cultural group
   f. use parents in gathering informal assessment data
7. Examine the reliability, validity, and standardization of any instrument used to assess the children.

8. Directors should have direct contact in hiring and continual communication with third-party evaluators.

Developing, Implementing, and Disseminating the Educational Model

Henry E. Hankerson

INTRODUCTION

The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program is concerned with the development of quality educational models to serve handicapped children and their families. Each HCEEP project progresses through stages of conceptualizing, planning, and implementing a model program. Careful planning and administration of the program prevent costly, frivolous, and counterproductive mistakes and ensure a rational, conceptual, and systematic approach to program implementation and dissemination.

Planning and administration of the educational model must grow out of the philosophical foundation upon which the program is based. Only after a philosophical stance has been established can proper goals and objectives for the particular program be identified and communicated, the process for implementing these goals be determined, and the means for reaching these goals be operationalized. A sound philosophical basis also affects decisions about evaluation and the selection of components, materials, and data for dissemination (Decker & Decker, 1976).

The purpose of this presentation is to help minority leaders understand and adapt concepts and strategies for the development, implementation, and dissemination of their HCEEP educational models, keeping in mind the special needs and concerns of those programs which target minority populations. The presentation will focus on three specific stages of the educational model: development, implementation, and dissemination. In each of these stages a major goal and some specific objectives can be identified. First, the goal of educational model development is to help participants determine and establish a program philosophy, program goals, and program policies. The objectives will

be to ensure that the philosophy selected is systematic, that the program goals are adequate, and that the program policies formulated will direct the functioning of all aspects of the specific programs.

Second, the goal of educational model implementation is to help participants develop and maintain curricula and activities. Specific objectives within this goal are to plan, schedule, and deliver children's and parent's activities, to encourage parental involvement, to organize and manage teaching/learning settings, and to use material and human resources to the best advantage of the children.

Finally, the goal of educational model dissemination is to share the products of the educational model in whole or in part with others. Objectives related to this goal include helping participants to identify those parts of the program which might be in greatest demand and which can be put into a replicable form for others and to identify ways to package and share their model as its various components are conceptualized.

DEVELOPING THE EDUCATIONAL MODEL

This section deals with planning and administering all those aspects of the program necessary for developing the educational model. An identifiable, systematic philosophy is the key to success for the HCEEP models as well as for any other educational programs. All aspects of the educational model must grow out of the program philosophy. Decker and Decker (1976) define philosophy as "what we believe about the educative experience of teaching and learning and the choices we make in controlling the educative experience" (p.10). They further describe philosophy to encompass beliefs about (1) children (i.e., child growth and development, child rearing), (2) the curricula, (3) teaching methodology, (4) program planning and administration (including housing, equipment, staff, and other services), and (5) evaluation (both program evaluation and child-assessment procedures). The beliefs that program personnel have about these components of the educational model are based on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired from studying developmental theories about the psychomotor, cognitive, and affective domains; these beliefs are the root of their daily activities.

There are many theoretical models available for early childhood programs, and the background, experience, and training of program personnel will dictate the facility for establishing a systematic program philosophy. Nevertheless,

whatever developmental theories and early childhood education program options are preferred by individual members of the staff, the educational model itself must reflect a program philosophy that is agreeable to all. Thus, the first step in planning the educational model is to reach a consensus among staff members to formulate a clear, if comprehensive, program philosophy.

Since many HCEEP programs are already developed when leadership is assumed, the following steps toward establishing a systematic, identifiable program philosophy should be considered. First, the program philosophy as it exists should be carefully analyzed in the following manner:

1. It should be studied in reference to the five components of the educational situation described by Decker and Decker; i.e., according to how it influences beliefs about children, curricula, teaching methodology, planning and administration, and evaluation.
2. Group consensus should be reached on each of these five points and the key points for each component should be recorded.
3. The key points should be organized and highlighted according to the common beliefs about the program in order to produce a written document outlining those beliefs.
4. The finished product should be studied by all staff members and reviewed for group discussion.
5. In order to ensure complete understanding, the program philosophy should be discussed in such a way that each member is required to comment upon it.

Second, the program philosophy should be used for program orientation to staff, parents, agencies, and persons sharing in the services of the program. Finally, a monitoring system should be devised to make sure that the written program philosophy can be interpreted verbally by program personnel. Once the philosophy has been developed, revised, or selected, the new program goals and objectives must be written in accordance with it.

The program goals will be determined by the program philosophy. Some factors common to the philosophy and to the goals and objectives are: the staff's assumptions about children, learning, and the purposes of the program; the children's ages; the communities in which the children live; and the cultural heritages and expectations of the program and of the participants (Schickedanz, York, Stewart, & White, 1977). When planning and administering minority programs, these goals and objectives must be founded upon

a philosophy which advocates sensitivity to cultural differences. The ultimate and general goal remains, however, that "each child live a happy childhood, reach his/her potential, and become a happy, fully functioning adult" (Hildebrand, 1976, p.24).

Special care and consideration must be given to the development of HCEEP models to meet the needs of young minority exceptional children. Whether these minorities include Blacks, Hispanics, Orientals, or other races, the goals and objectives of the educational models and programs must reflect appropriate features and basic attributes of quality child development programs. In 1972, the Black Child Development Institute began to identify some basic principles for implementing "good" programs for Black children (Dill, 1972). These principles are offered in this presentation as relevant to all minority programs. Thus, when extending program philosophy into goals and objectives, the program staff must ensure that the goals and objectives of the educational model meet the following requirements.

1. The goals and objectives must be designed, implemented, and controlled by the parents and other community residents as participants in this educational endeavor.
2. They must extend to the child's family and cultural environment. Thus the family and school personnel become partners to ensure that the program does not replace the family and cultural heritage.
3. They must develop and strengthen the child's feeling of self. The child's self-image, personal identity, dignity, and ethnic membership must be nurtured to prepare the child to relate positively to the surrounding environment.
4. They must include a definitive educational curriculum, including basic skills and a respect for learning that are germane to everyday living.
5. They must ensure that staff members are qualified to teach and understand the minority child and to develop curricula to meet the needs assessed.
6. They must call for services that are supportive to educational curricula. These include social services, psychological services, medical services, and nutritional services.
7. They must include services to children with special needs. These services should be well rounded and stimulating to support the educational curricula.
8. They must provide for a safe, positive, caring atmosphere for children in order to enhance growth and development.

9. They must provide for parental involvement through participatory activities, education, and training so that there is continuity in the teaching/learning process within the program and the home.
10. Finally, the goals and objectives must require use of the minority communities' resources in program operations through research, teaching, and development.

The philosophy, goals, and objectives within individual educational models for minority groups can be further systematized through the establishment of policies. Policies are statements of preferred means for achieving goals (Miller, Madeen, & Kincheloe, 1972). For minority leaders, policies can serve as great assets toward total management since they will cover the principal situations commonly occurring in the program. Usually, a project's board of directors or governing body is responsible for formulating policies, and the program director/administrator is responsible for the execution of the policies. The board should provide adequate written and verbal explanations of policies and suggestions for methods of executing policies (Decker & Decker, 1976). The director/administrator is responsible for: (1) informing the board of needs for additional policies or changes in the existing ones; (2) pinpointing inconsistencies in policies; and (3) keeping the board abreast of the community's attitudes and values.

In the case of HCEEP programs, however, policies are often established in a more eclectic fashion--that is, as the result of segments of boards representing the participating agencies. These include the Office of Special Education, public school systems, CAP organizations, community agencies, private and public corporations, civic organizations, governmental agencies, hospitals, clinics, and others. In most cases among HCEEP programs, mandated policies are used as administrative guidelines by the project director. Nevertheless, all programs are required to have an "advisory council" which serves a different function. In many cases, the responsibilities of this council are not clearly specified. It is even more apparent in minority programs that the roles and responsibilities are unclear and confusing for the advisory council. Much of this chaos is precipitated by the fact that the philosophy, goals, and objectives of the educational model are incongruent with the purpose, needs, and expectations of the people and community to be served. Therefore, minority project leaders must generate strategies for ameliorating the approaches presently used to formulate policies in isolation of research data, theory, and expertise about minorities.

When developing policies, consideration must be given to state, federal, and local regulations affecting the program's goals and objectives; criteria to assure fair treatment and protection of the program, staff, children, and parents; and criteria which provide a basis for evaluating, planning, and administering the program. Establishing policies for minority programs ensures that the criteria facilitate achievement of the program's goals, and helps to overcome the prevailing tradition of operating these programs by expediency. Since policies are formulated from the philosophy, goals, and objectives of the program, they should be followed and interpreted consistently, thereby reducing the probability of constant change in the program operations.

Since policies are guidelines which establish the foundation for administrative action, they should not be highly specific. More specific requirements should be stated in the rules, regulations, and procedures developed from the policies. For example, the fee policy should indicate criteria for assessing fees (e.g., tuition will be assessed at one rate for German Park residents, and at another rate for nonresidents); the fee regulation should state the specific amount charged (e.g., the fee for a child living in the boundary of German Park is $57.50 per week). This concept that policies not be specific helps the program to operate in a flexible manner with little or no change in the policies. Yet, specific aspects necessary to keep the program operating at a high level of efficiency may be as flexible as the day-to-day operations require. Similarly, program policies should be subject to review and change as written policy specifies. Periodic review of all policies is necessary to keep the program abreast of the changing philosophy, goals, and objectives as the needs of the program, children, staff, parents, and others dictate (Decker & Decker, 1976). Minority leaders must push for periodic review. A key source for updating these periodic reviews can be the advisory council.

All aspects of the educational model and program should have policies to cover their operation. Variations in program models require different categories of policies. Decker and Decker (1976) offer the following five policy categories as those used by most early childhood programs: (1) administrative policy which includes forming boards, appointments, and functions of supervisory personnel; (2) staff-personnel policy which covers recruitment, selection, appointment, qualifications, job assignments, evaluation, tenure, separation, salary schedules, fringe benefits, absences, leaves, personal and professional activities; (3) child-personnel policy which comprises admission, attendance, program services, termination of program services, assessing and reporting children's progress, provisions for

child welfare (accidents and insurance), and special activities (field trips, plays, and class celebrations); (4) business policy which includes sources of funding, nature of budget, categories of expenditures, guidelines and procedures for purchasing goods and services, and system of accounts and auditing procedures; and (5) public relations policy which includes participation by the public, use of program facilities, relations with various agencies and associations, and media used for communication with the public.

As attempts are being made to determine new education constructs for development and implementation, program administrators are charged with the responsibility of assessing the needs of the minority populations to be served. These needs will then be addressed through the planning and administration of the program with input from the advisory council and the efforts of staff in developing, implementing, and disseminating the educational model. Planning and administration components, germane to the development of the educational model, include these activities:

1. Understanding the administrative organization. Project leaders and staff should be aware of administrative functions and organizational patterns. Financing and budgeting are important administrative aspects.
2. Knowing regulations for operating. Regulations are the rules, directives, statutes, and standards that prescribe, direct, limit, and govern the program (Decker & Decker, 1976). These may include: licensing, incorporation, public school regulations, the federal interagency day care requirements, fire safety and sanitation requirements, zoning regulations, transportation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI, local board regulations, regulations concerning administration, and teacher and paraprofessional qualifications.
3. Staffing the program. The quality of the staff determines to a high degree the excellence of the program. Therefore, care and consideration must be given to: the roles and qualifications of personnel, staff development, and personnel services and records.
4. Providing proper facilities for the program. The key issue is providing facilities that are physically and psychologically adequate and comfortable. Attention is given to the entry-exit area, indoor space, outdoor space, and insurance coverage for the facility, equipment, and materials.

5. Deciding on equipment and materials. Decisions on specific equipment and materials for the program are determined by the educational goals/objectives. Since they have a major influence on both staff and children, consideration must be given to purchasing, arranging, and caring for instructional materials and a professional library. Also, community resources need to be compiled for instructional purposes.
6. Building curriculum and designing instruction. Curriculum must be provided to facilitate knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities (psychomotor, cognitive, and affective). Emphasis must be placed on planning and scheduling activities in all areas of the curricula (prereading, writing, mathematics, social studies, science, music, art, etc.). Teaching and instruction must address the young minority exceptional child and be designed to facilitate positive appreciation of the various ethnic heritages.
7. Working with parents and other community resources. The Black Child Development Institute (Dill, 1972) identified this area as being a basic ingredient for implementing "good" programs for Black children. The implications were that: "educational models for minority programs must be designed, implemented, and controlled by the parents and other community residents as participants in the educational endeavors" (p. 36).
8. Assessing, recording, and reporting the progress of children and other program components. These means of evaluation serve as key elements in planning and implementing all services of the program, in guiding the development of each child, and in communicating with parents, the public, and other regulatory agencies. This is an important phase to be treated in operating minority programs, since assessing, recording, and reporting have frequently been areas of concern for minority groups.

Developing the educational model entails all of the programmatic aspects just discussed. The initial, overall, and continuous planning and administering of effective educational model programs must begin with some perspective of the nature and extent of what is needed and what is expected to happen. The discussion of philosophy, goals, objectives, and policies was presented to assist minority leaders in reviewing their educational models and identifying areas which need further development. The

other relevant areas of the total educational model program have been addressed for the sake of continuity in operating an effective program for young children. A holistic conceptualization of the developing profile magnifies the rationale for implementing the educational model program for minority populations through a systematic approach by: (1) formulating program philosophies that are relevant to the needs, expectations, and capabilities of the target audiences; (2) setting goals in conjunction with the systematic philosophy; and (3) adopting/adapting the emergent policies of the program with the utilization of appropriate minority expertise and research data and information.

IMPLEMENTING THE EDUCATIONAL MODEL

Adequate planning and administration of the educational model during its development will yield efficiency in implementation. Implementing the model requires effective management in operationalizing its various components, in keeping with the program philosophy, goals, and policies. These programmatic aspects must be considered simultaneously since all facets influence each other. Proper implementation means that services are planned and evaluated continuously; that business affairs are conducted consistently; that personnel services are initiated and maintained in accord with needs and functions; that auxiliary services are integrated in the total operation of the program through adequate supervision and coordination; that channels for communication and exchange of information are provided and utilized; that curricula and methodology are designed and utilized to coincide with the needs and goals of the population to be served; and that facilities are adequate, appropriate, and used to carry out the activities. Assessment, recording, and reporting are key factors in the evaluation of these program operations.

All HCEEP demonstration projects are organized into five major components. Consistent planning and administration of these components will facilitate the implementation of the educational model. These program components are:

1. Administration and management, which deals with the overall organization, administration and management of the project;
2. Services for children, which includes locating, screening, and admitting children into the project, and curriculum and instructional plans;

3. Services for parents, which deals with providing services to parents and other family members and for involving parents in project operations;
4. Staff development, which serves to determine staff development needs, resources, and plans to meet those needs as the professional development of the project staff is implemented; and
5. Demonstration, dissemination, and continuation, which relates to the project's plans for impacting upon local, state, and national services.

Implementing an educational model requires that project administrators consider several important factors:

1. The recruitment of sufficient and qualified staff to implement the program components;
2. The identification of appropriate, curriculum materials, supplies, equipment, and facilities for program implementation;
3. The development of techniques for keeping records, assessing, and reporting program information on various aspects of the components;
4. The establishment of staff roles and responsibilities for each component;
5. The identification of ample human resources to implement the program components; and
6. The selection and identification of target audiences and sources for outreach, replication, and continuation of the program components.

Because the general program philosophy, goals, policies, and activities often are different for the minority than for the majority population, the implementation of a planned educational model faces unique problems. Staffing is sometimes difficult because of a shortage of qualified personnel sensitive to minority groups. Project leaders from minority groups may be hard to find since few have been functioning in management positions. Thus, additional training and technical assistance is required for staff and project leaders, and much time can be spent trying to find the appropriate personnel. Technical assistance can be delayed or obstructed, too, because of the difficulty in finding resource persons who can provide the necessary services and who are sensitive and knowledgeable enough about minority groups to deal with them effectively.

Additionally, implementing a demonstration model, a process which often taxes programs serving majority populations, is particularly frustrating to minority projects which deliver services to a population already underserved. Direct services to children and parents must be cut in order to meet the model program requirements and the cutbacks

are not easily justified to minority groups. A related problem is the difficulty of finding, using, and developing curriculum materials for minority projects. Thus, technical assistance from external agencies is crucial to minority projects.

Record keeping and reporting are two other areas which pose difficulties for minority staff members. Since the major goal of many minority programs is to provide direct services from an experiential base rather than from written curricula and specific plans for children and/or parents, record keeping is not a customary responsibility. Reporting is hindered by the sometimes unsophisticated audiences, the sensitivity of minority groups to certain terms, and the inaccuracy in assessment due to the use of inappropriate instruments. Assessment, therefore, is sometimes incongruous with teaching.

Finally, rearrangement of lifestyles for parents of minority children sometimes presents problems. Children must often be transported long distances; the settings are not always designed to make parents feel comfortable; and meeting appointment deadlines and attending treatment follow-up often require extensive readjustment in a family's lifestyle.

Implementing the educational model requires direct attention to be given to all of the areas expressed in the section on developing the educational model. A key concern in the process of implementing the educational model is making sure that all of the components are working together effectively and harmoniously to achieve the goals of the project.

DISSEMINATING THE EDUCATIONAL MODEL

Disseminating the educational model is a vital aspect of the HCEEP projects; it is the means for sharing materials and information with other groups serving the handicapped. It was information sharing that the legislators counted upon to promote service to the total U.S. handicapped population, for dissemination is the key to the "transferability" of the programs (Davis, 1975). It is important, therefore, that project leaders identify tasks related to the projects' plans for impacting upon their communities. These include communicating with the general public, with specific target audiences, and with community resources, in order to provide for continuation funding beyond the years of OSE support. Activities that are integral parts of dissemination are

demonstration and continuation. These are considered transfer activities and are described as "outreach" when the project shares its findings and results with other groups working with similar populations of children; they are described as "replication" when these other programs or groups buy into the reproductions of the educational model.

Davis (1975) describes five steps necessary to developing and transferring a program. The first step is to develop a model program. The second step is to gear the model toward demonstration efforts targeting other organizations and persons interested in acquiring knowledge, skills, and expertise in developing programs. The third step is to develop products. Product development is a way of showing the program to others and requires determining the parts to be packaged and disseminated. Step four includes selling the products to be used or adapted by other groups or programs. The fifth step is for the model program to assist the new program in properly implementing the products. A phase-out method must be employed as the new program becomes proficient in its implementation of the product(s). Davis reminds us that while this strategy might seem systematic and uncomplicated, it can turn out to be confusing and frustrating because of adverse financial matters, staff loads, lack of expertise in various areas, and so forth.

Aware of the difficulties in disseminating the educational model, OSE provides technical assistance in this area through the services of TADS and WESTAR. A publication edited by Gunn (1975), which provides relevant and important information about disseminating the educational model, is a key reference that will help project leaders determine ways to identify replicable products, to select target audiences, and to package and disseminate their products.

Since disseminating the educational model is the ultimate purpose of HCEEP projects, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes developed through the model must be converted into products that will benefit others. These products must be based on the needs of particular audiences, following critical assessment of their characteristics. Through development and implementation, then, relevant information about the model will be collected and tested in the classroom; the effectiveness of the model will be evaluated in terms of its contributions to the children and their parents; and, if the model proves to be effective and to reach its goals and objectives, the components should be developed into relevant, credible, and persuasive products that will serve the needs of the target audiences.

Demonstration projects must find many ways to package information about the model in order to influence large numbers of people. Many projects use logos and slogans to

capture audiences. Public awareness information may be provided by the projects through the production of flyers, newspaper articles, posters, newsletters, radio announcements, audio slide-shows, and others. Demonstrations are provided to on-site visitors and to other organizations, as well as to the public. In addition, the advisory council members publicize the efforts of the demonstration projects and provide additional resources for implementation. Much of the information about the educational model is kept on a daily basis through the record-keeping, assessment, and reporting materials available to the project staff, regulating agency, and others.

Wood (1975) reported a case study in replication as a model that would be helpful to projects in mobilizing their own replication efforts. Her case study represents the Rutland project, which used 11 general strategies for accomplishing statewide replication. Minority projects can benefit from the strategies even if they have to adapt them to varying needs, goals, and situations. As reported by Wood (1975, pp. 151-52), these strategies are:

- -Assess the community's needs, define the problem situation, and then develop a solution. Be prepared to sell a well-conceptualized program.
- -Identify the power structure. Approach an influential group that would be greatly concerned about programs for the handicapped and solicit their support.
- -Be available for free consultation.
- -Make the community aware of the problem and the fact that something can be done.
- -Encourage community members to contact their legislators.
- -Convince a state agency that this is their problem.
- -Propose the program and request reasonable funding.
- -Administrative personnel should have demonstrated competency in the field, not just seniority.
- -Staff must fully understand program objectives and procedures to perform effectively.
- -An evaluation model must be an integrated part of the program.
- -Keep objectives in mind constantly; if the program begins to stray, refocus the activities or reevaluate the objectives.

Attention focused on these strategies will aid the minority programs in disseminating the educational model program.

SUMMARY

Developing, implementing, and disseminating the educational model presents various challenges, frustrations, and joys. This presentation was geared toward overcoming the frustrations and obstacles and facilitating efficient functioning of all components of the HCEEP projects. All of the issues raised--establishing a program philosophy, implementing a planned educational model, serving minority populations, establishing cultural sensitivity, and disseminating the educational model--have been explored in view of strengthening minority leadership in the HCEEP network. Those identified with the projects are acutely aware of the challenges in completing the charge of operating quality programs for children with handicaps. Minority leaders must be prepared to challenge prescribed paths and to provide functional, creative alternatives for effective program operations.

REFERENCES

Bissell, J.S. Implementation of Planned Variation in Head Start. Review and summary of the Stanford Research Institute report: First year of evaluation. Washington, DC: Office of Child Development, 1971.

Bissell, J.S. The cognitive effects of preschool programs for disadvantaged children. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), Revisiting early childhood education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Davis, D. "Introduction." In L. Gunn (Ed.), Outreach: Replicating services for young handicapped children. Chapel Hill, NC: Technical Assistance Development System, 1975.

Decker, C.A., & Decker, J. R. Planning and administering early childhood programs. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.

Dill, J.R. Basic principles of good child development. In Curriculum approaches from a black perspective. Proceedings of Black Child Development Institute Workshop, Atlanta, GA, October 1972.

Hildebrand, V. Introduction to early childhood education (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan, 1976.

Martin, B.D. Teaching young children. Albany, NY: Delmar Publishers, 1975.

Miller, V., Madeen, G., & Kincheloe, J. The public administration of public school systems. (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan, 1972.

Schickedanz, J.A., York, M.E., Stewart, I.S., & White D. Strategies for teaching young children. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Wood, M.M. A case study in replication. In L. Gunn (Ed.), Outreach: Replicating services for young handicapped children. Chapel Hill, NC: Technical Assistance Development System, 1975.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR MODEL DEVELOPMENT

GOAL: To develop a model program in such a way as to reflect the uniqueness of minority handicapped children and their families.

To develop a program philosophy, project leaders can:

1. Establish program philosophy based upon a reflection of the cultural values of the community in which the program is located.
2. Focus the program philosophy on enhancing and enriching the culture of the children involved in the program.
3. Indicate the importance of the family structure within the appropriate cultural context.
4. Draw up a systematic program philosophy by:
   a. forming a task force representative of community
   b. identifying needs
   c. writing philosophy
   d. sharing it with community leaders and families

To develop program policy, project leaders can:

1. Establish clear written program policy statements and include these in the proposal.
2. Maintain flexibility in developing program policy.
3. Represent on the advisory board the ethnic/cultural background of children in the same proportion as those children being served by the program.

To implement the program, project leaders can:

1. Gain confidence and support of parents.
2. Teach parents the developmental stages of children's progress.
3. Begin documenting program effects early, so that changes can be made which are based on data.

To staff the program, project leaders can:

1. Involve all staff as a team and carefully delineate the responsibilities of each team member.
2. Hire staff who can speak in terms parents can understand and who have a personal teaching philosophy consistent with the program's philosophy.
3. Involve local community people and parents in every role possible on staff (teachers, paraprofessional, and volunteers).
4. Upgrade staff skills and professional levels through inservice education which may be sought through OSE Division of Personnel Preparation funds linked to colleges and universities, and state training monies such as those set aside for P.L. 94-142 implementation.
5. Set paraprofessional staff wages at higher than minimum wages to attract better qualified minority/local community applicants.

To disseminate the program, project leaders can:

1. Submit position papers/documents to organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children.

2. Participate in local conferences and meetings such as those sponsored by state departments of education.

3. Link with other service programs to generate a more substantial funding base.

4. Use one-to-one persuasion to foster good public relations.

5. Clarify the program purposes, staff, and components for replication in the third year.

6. Target materials to specific audiences.

7. Convene people from various agencies to discuss the demonstration project.

8. Use local communication networks such as radio, TV, and bumper stickers publicize accomplishments.

9. Survey comprehensively all of the service components which directly impact on the project. For example, using a regional map, designate social agencies which can or do provide services to the project.

Cultural Awareness: Working with Parents of Handicapped Children

Teresa Brito

This presentation focused on the cultural awareness of personnel who work with minority parents and on their sensitivity to the unique needs of these parents. Historical factors which have contributed to the error of assuming cultural homogeneity in common language groups were discussed, especially as they pertain to cultural values, bilingualism, socioeconomic structure, and personnel preparation.

VALUES. It is important that the educator or home visitor recognize that value systems cannot be stereotyped. Value systems vary among individuals and are diversified among subcultural groups within minority populations. Sensitivity to the variability of values becomes critical when trying to relate to parents, and most importantly, to the relationship that exists between parents and their children.

During this portion of the presentation, issues raised in some of the literature (Robinson & Robinson, 1963; Mitsos, 1978) were addressed and analyzed in respect to working with culturally different parents. Furthermore, through examples from experiences in working with minority families, the presenter analyzed each of the five stages identified by Mitsos (Denial, Anger, Bargaining, Depression, Acceptance).

BILINGUALISM. The diverse characteristics that exist within a common language group were discussed in relation to awareness of what it means to be bilingual. A study by Laosa (1975) was shared in order to emphasize the necessity of recognizing that the language changes radically from one geographical area to another; this study shows that "not only are there several distinct Spanish-American groups in the United States alone with quite different cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic characteristics, but it is becoming increasingly apparent within each of the subgroups, there is considerable variability" (p. 236).

SOCIOECONOMIC STRUCTURE. In addition to other cultural factors which influence the progress of both parents and children, the exigencies of living in an economically deprived situation were discussed. The main points were that a person who works with families that live in substandard conditions should be constantly aware that this factor aggravates an already stressful situation. More importantly, the person providing the service should recognize that because of the situation, he or she must provide these services at the convenience of the family. Often there will have to be additional intervention provided (e.g., referrals to other appropriate agencies such as food stamp offices and employment services) before actual work with the parents can commence.

PERSONNEL PREPARATION. The need for better and more teacher training programs which offer courses that address bilingual/bicultural issues and the need for inservice training in multicultural awareness were the final subjects of inquiry. The presenter dealt with each of the issues by sharing anecdotes of her experiences in conducting parent groups and counseling parents on a one-to-one basis. The main goal of the presentation was to sensitize the audience to cultural awareness--that is, regardless of a common language bond among groups, families are unique and, more critically, subcultural groups exist within groups with heterogeneous needs.

REFERENCES

Laosa, L.M. Bilingualism in three U.S. Hispanic groups: Contextual use of language by children and adults in their families. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67(5), 617-627.

Mitsos, S.P. The grieving process of parents of atypical children. A Special Report. Evansville, Indiana: The Rehabilitation Agency, 1978.

Robinson, N. M., & Robinson, H. B. The mentally retarded child: A psychological approach. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR CULTURAL AWARENESS

GOAL: To recognize and appreciate individual cultural differences in the families served by HCEEP.

To effectively work with parents of diverse backgrounds, project directors must:

1. Have an accepting attitude toward all parents.
2. Learn about the culture of the families.
3. Identify one's own values.
4. Visit parents where parents are most comfortable, in their homes.
5. Listen rather than provide advice.
6. Have families design an individualized self- and group-evaluation tool.
7. Establish a pilot program in which two to four randomly selected parents share common and individual areas of aspiration and/or concern.
8. Have this parent group determine personal and family goals (primary and secondary) to be accomplished over a specified period of time.
9. Assist public schools see the value in forming a working partnership with parents.

Facilitating Communication: The Action Planning Approach

Bertram Coppock, Jr.

Before implementing any program, it is necessary to establish communication with parents in the target population, with professionals working in similar projects or in support programs, and among the program's own staff members. Minority programs often face particular difficulty initiating communication, for it is sometimes hard for minority leaders to gain acceptance among certain parent populations or to establish rapport with other professionals or with their own staffs. Furthermore, because staff members often have different backgrounds, objectives, and communication strategies, interaction among staff members may not always be effective or efficient. This paper will present one means of coordinating staff interaction to facilitate effective problem solving--the action planning approach.

The problems encountered in implementing new services for handicapped children can best be solved if approached in an organized systematic manner such as the action planning approach. Action planning presents a series of steps to assist either individuals or groups in solving problems. The steps include brainstorming the conditions either favorably or unfavorably affecting a problem, targeting objectives for change, identifying both supporting factors and barriers to the solution, identifying the resources available, and finally, setting out the tasks necessary to accomplish the solution.

The first step in action planning is to take a question and identify as many conditions affecting it as possible. Since the emphasis at this point is on generating quantity, all of the conditions that come to mind should be written down for 15-20 minutes. Another 15-20 minutes should then be taken to review the list, consolidating, revising, and eliminating conditions where necessary. Next, the five most important possible solutions should be selected, and a change objective be written for each one. The change objective restates the solution so that it answers the following questions:

1. WHAT is to be changed?
2. WHO is going to change or be changed?
3. HOW will the WHO or WHAT be changed?
4. WHERE will the change occur?
5. WHEN will the change occur?
6. Is this a positive or negative idea?

The change objectives are then each analyzed using force field analysis in order to identify where potential problems are that may interfere with the solution and where supports and resources are that will facilitate the solution. To implement the force field analysis the facilitating forces for each change objective are listed in one column and the restraining forces in another. Once the facilitating and restraining forces are listed, the change objectives must be reevaluated in light of the analysis, with particular attention to the objectives in which the opposing forces can be used to cancel one another out. In order to complete the next step, which is to reexamine, clarify, and finalize those objectives in terms of their appropriateness and format, the following questions should be addressed.

1. Is the change objective achievable?
2. Is the change objective reasonable? Practical?
3. Is this the best available alternative?
4. Is the group committed to accomplishing the change objective or just going through the motions?
5. Is the change objective clearly and concisely stated?
6. Is it understandable?
7. Is it stated in measurable terms?

Through this reevaluation the most appropriate objectives for change are identified and designed so that they are ready for the final steps: assessing resources and planning the steps to accomplish the objective. When assessing resources at this level it is important that the planner go beyond the force field analysis resources and, in addition, account for all of the human, personal, and physical resources necessary to accomplish the objective. These should be listed indicating wherever possible how other systems will be utilized to provide resources. The final step in the overall process is to identify the particular steps necessary for accomplishing the objective, to list them in logical order, and to indicate the starting and completion date for each step.

This approach provides a straightfoward method of examining problems and finding solutions to them without an extraordinary investment of resources. The time and commitment of the change agents are the major investments.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

GOAL: To establish communication, rapport, and acceptance of minority leaders by parents and other professionals.

To establish communication, rapport, and acceptance, project leaders can:

1. "Study to show thyself approved." Nonminority parents can be impressed by a quality program and an expertly run operation.
2. If, on the other hand, a program serves a less sophisticated segment of the population, it would be wise to (a) hire a nonminority program staff to secure the support of one or two leaders within the nonminority parents, and (b) hire a sensitive minority staff person to work with these persons in soliciting frank, open responses and concerns.

To facilitate communication with staff, project leaders can:

1. Document staff performance in an ongoing manner throughout the year to decrease and alleviate problems.
2. Devise a systematic approach to problem solving which incorporates alternative strategies for handling situations as they arise for both short range and long range problems.
3. Use job descriptions to clarify and break down staff responsibilities as a means for alleviating problems.

To facilitate communication with parents, project leaders can:

1. Take extra time to listen to parents' concerns.

2. Set convenient meeting times for parents, such as Saturdays or after school, with play groups available for children and transportation for the family.

3. Give parents positive feedback about their children's performance.

4. Deal with parents' feelings about having a handicapped child from the perspective of the cultural/ethnic group of the family.

5. Before interacting with minority families, train staff to understand the values of the cultural group.

Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies

Section 1: Bruce Ramirez

The lack of cooperation among agencies serving preschool handicapped children has often resulted in failure to provide needed services, costly duplication of services, and interagency competition. This problem is particularly significant in rural areas where federal, state, and local agencies are scattered over wide geographic areas and where it is difficult to recruit and maintain the specialized staff needed to educate handicapped children. Interagency agreements are an effective way to provide services in these areas. Involvement in an established network such as HCEEP puts one in a unique position to coordinate these scattered services.

The Governmental Relations Unit of the Council for Exceptional Children has been collecting and analyzing data on interagency cooperation from American Indian and Alaskan tribes and communities across the country. The data are being compiled in a policy manual which outlines a three-step process for setting up cooperative agreements among state and local agencies, serving rural handicapped children. The steps are to: (1) determine the extent of the need for service, (2) survey the agencies in the area which serve some segment of the population, and (3) agree to a means by which services will be provided. An explanation of the process, with examples from the Native American policy study, follows.

The first step is determining the scope of your needs and the extent of your resources. These factors need to be addressed:

- -The characteristics of the children served by the program (age, disability, cultural background, geographic area).
- -The kinds of services needed by these children but not presently available.
- -The number of children in need of these services.
- -The agencies and private practitioners presently providing services to handicapped children in the community.

As an example, the policy study found that, within a single community, the agencies with regulations to educate handicapped children may include the BIA Office of Indian Education, BIA Social Services, Indian Health Services, State Department of Education, State Department of Health, State Department of Mental Health or Mental Retardation, and specific tribal agencies.

An education unit may want to consider purchasing needed services for these conditions: (1) rural, remote or isolated service areas, (2) low incidence exceptionalities, (3) need for additional or different special education and related services personnel, and (4) cost effectiveness of purchased services. Contracted services typically include: counseling, diagnostic, educational, inservice training, medical, neurological, occupational therapy, physical therapy, psychological, social, speech and hearing, and transportation.

The second step is to contact existing service agencies to determine those which can be of the most assistance to your program. For each service provider, this information should be gathered: the kinds of services available; the ages and handicapping conditions of children served, and any restrictions; the experience of agency personnel with culturally diverse children; the cost of services; the usual time frame for service delivery and follow-up; restrictions on the transfer of personally identifiable information; and the availability of inservice training for program staff.

The final step is to agree upon the means by which services will be provided, whether by informal agreements, memoranda of agreements, or formal contracts. The policy study found these items as necessary for inclusion in the contract:

1. Education unit purchasing services
2. Specification of services to be contracted
3. Duration of contract
4. Agency/organization/individual providing service(s)
5. Qualifications of individuals providing services
6. Designation of financial responsibilities
7. Evaluation component of services provided
8. Signatures of officials with authority to enter into contractual agreements

When an educational agency follows a systematic procedure for establishing interagency agreements, more effective and cost-efficient services for children will result.

Section 2: Yetta W. Galiber

The following quotation from a recent presentation to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Galiber, Note 1) introduces a special concern of minority program administrators for the difficulties of effective community services for minority handicapped children.

> A brief glance at the contours of our national patterns would at first serve to support the belief that we have only infinite reverence and tenderest compassion for our handicapped citizens. Yet, upon closer examination, we see that too many minority handicapped persons are hungry, unclothed, unemployed, unsheltered, and completely unaware of the better life which is their right. . . .
>
> In the last two decades, in an effort to express our growing concern for neglected persons, our society has thrust itself deeply into the area of personal rehabilitation. This concern has been evidenced nowhere more strongly than in legislation resulting in programs designed to help handicapped persons. . . .
>
> Members of racial/ethnic groups are isolated from the mainstream of the service delivery systems and experience great problems in locating and accessing services. . . .
>
> Advocacy and [community] outreach are essential if the necessary program changes are to be made to ensure services for ethnic minority handicapped persons. . . .

As an example of the positive effects of community liaisons, the history of the Information Center for Handicapped Individuals, Inc. in Washington, D.C. will be presented. The methods used by ICHI demonstrate effective ways of establishing and maintaining liaison with other programs and agencies.

In 1969 the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped [now the Office of Special Education] funded the Information Center for Handicapped Children as a community outreach program designed to identify, educate and link the handicapped population with available resources and services. The initial undertaking of this agency was the

identification of services for handicapped children in the District of Columbia metropolitan area, utilizing the services of graduate students in the field of special education. A questionnaire was developed to collect specific program information, including admission procedures, description of available services, area served and so on. The students visited libraries, health and welfare councils, the Department of Human Resources, and other agencies to identify existing public service programs. Public Service Announcements (PSA) on radio and television and in the print media were used to identify and promote programs and to announce the services of the Center. The compilation of this information resulted in the publication of the Directory of Services for Handicapping Conditions.

An intensive outreach program was implemented to ensure that low-income minority parents of handicapped children were made aware of the services of the Center. As a result of these efforts, an increasing number of calls were received from these parents. The inquiries of parents indicated a lack of information regarding community services and discouragement because their children were not receiving diagnosis, treatment, and appropriate educational services. Many calls were received from parents whose children were labeled profoundly mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed which meant exclusion from public education. As the calls were documented and collated, the gaps between needs and available services became more evident.

The Information Center for Handicapped Children moved to the forefront in the effort to identify the comprehensive needs of handicapped children, stimulate the development of new services, and effect philosophical and policy changes in the development of community services. In its advocacy role, the Center identified the children who were plaintiffs in the celebrated case of Peter Mills et al. vs. the Board of Education et al. Judge Joseph P. Waddy's ruling that it was unconstitutional to deprive handicapped children of an appropriate public education literally revolutionized educational opportunities for handicapped children, opening previously inaccessible educational programs and creating new ones where needs warranted.

Another advocacy activity was the establishment of a coalition of public and private agencies serving preschool handicapped children. The Children's Coalition provided the data which was used as justification for federal funds to establish "Good Start," a preschool program for handicapped children.

The Center instituted unique outreach efforts in order to reach persons with particular language or other barriers associated with racial/ethnic background. Even though

their service needs were similar to other minority handicapped persons, the Center found that they needed special assistance in becoming cognizant of available resources and services. The Center hired bilingual staff and published the Directory of Social Services for the Spanish-Speaking Community as a means of identifying resources, developing indigenous leadership, and educating them to rights and effective individual advocacy.

The passing of P.L. 94-142 set forth the fundamental rights of all handicapped children to a free appropriate public education. As with the Waddy decree, legislation without proper implementation results in the denial of rights, especially to minority persons. The Center currently provides training and assistance to parents regarding the provisions of P.L. 94-142 and the importance of parent participation in the development of the child's Individual Education Program. Once parents clearly understand their rights, effective child advocacy is ensured. A Client Assistance Project authorized by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 112, also has been developed. The objectives of the project are to assist clients in solving problems related to service delivery within the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Administration.

In 1975 the Information Center's Board of Directors, recognizing that the Center had broadened its program to include the entire handicapped population from birth through adulthood, unanimously adopted an Amendment to the Articles of Incorporation changing the name of the Center to the Information Center for Handicapped Individuals, Inc.

In 1979, the mayor designated the Center as the Protection and Advocacy System for Developmentally Disabled Persons in the District of Columbia. P.L. 94-103 as amended by P.L. 95-602 established Protection and Advocacy Systems in each state to ensure human and civil rights to developmentally disabled persons. The Center helps developmentally disabled persons obtain services and protects their legal rights to health care, proper housing, training, employment, and adequate financial support.

During its ten-year existence, the Center has implemented several unfunded projects in an effort to meet the needs of minority handicapped individuals. The "Rehabilitation through Habilitation" program provides evaluations resulting in proper placement for developmentally disabled children and young adults who appear before the Superior Court. In most instances, these individuals have been denied an adequate educational program to meet their needs or were expelled from public schools. "Saturday Tutorial Program" helps students on a one-to-one basis to acquire academic skills, personal adjustment, and achievement of social and occupational competence. In another

phase of the program, local prison residents accompany handicapped children to community activities. The "Annual Christmas Store" provides donations of toys, clothes, and money to bring Christmas joy to needy handicapped children and their families. Prison inmates, community volunteers, and center staff collect donations, repair toys, sort, wash, and press clothing. Toys are priced and each person is given $10 play money to make purchases. While the children are purchasing toys, parents select clothing for the entire family. Finally, the Center sponsors a pageant for disabled women to demonstrate the productivity, dignity, and basic value of disabled people and to sensitize the public of the need to eliminate attitudinal and architectural barriers to their social functioning.

These community activities have demonstrated the effectiveness of interagency liaison. Establishing contacts with other service agencies appears to be a sensible, practical, and cost-effective means to maximizing the rights to productive living of handicapped children and adults.

REFERENCE NOTE

1. Galiber, Y. Consultation on civil rights issues for Americans: Public policy implications. Washington, D.C., May 13 & 14, 1980.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

GOAL: To link agencies within the community for more efficient and effective service delivery to handicapped children.

To establish liaisons with community programs and agencies, project leaders can:

1. Conduct a thorough investigation of prospective cooperating agencies with relation to:

a. funding sources
b. legislative mandate
c. service delivery systems
d. population of children and families served

2. Formulate a "task team" with two appointees from each agency.

3. Share information gathered about each agency to the "task team" group by way of a comparison/contrast chart.

4. Jointly plan a series of approaches to developing cooperative service agreements.

Part 2

Panel Presentations

Part 2 summarizes the content of two panel presentations dealing with minority involvement in professional organizations and federal program resources. Contributors to panel presentations are identified in footnotes.

Support for Services: Federal Programs and Resources for Funding

Several federal agencies within the U.S. Department of Education support programs related to early childhood and multicultural education. Researching these programs can identify potential funding and information sources for the development and maintenance of services for young handicapped children. This section highlights several resource agencies and concludes with a list of references for further information on these and other public and private funding sources.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) supports a number of grants and contracts designed to develop innovative programs for young exceptional children (ages birth to 8 years) and their families. Over the years, a variety of educational, therapeutic, and social

---

Contributors to this session from federal agencies included: Ed Wilson from the Office of Special Education, Charles Miller from the Office of Bilingual Education, Hakim Khan from the Office of Indian Education, and Charles Cordova from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. James Cox, TADS, concluded the presentation with suggestions and references for researching and approaching potential funding sources.

service models have been developed through HCEEP funds and continued with other funds. Because of interagency cooperation on local and state levels, many public and private service agencies are providing more comprehensive and complementary services for young exceptional children and families. The HCEEP projects themselves are also working together; projects in at least eight states have formed active consortia to promote statewide services in cooperation with State Education Agencies. In recent years, three national interest groups have been organized to address rural service delivery, infant intervention, and leadership by minority professionals.

DEMONSTRATION grants are made to public and private nonprofit agencies to develop multifaceted direct service models for the education of young handicapped children. Program components include child identification and assessment, educational/therapeutic programming, evaluation of child progress, active parent/family participation, staff inservice training, coordination with public schools and other community service agencies, evaluation of the effectiveness of model components, and demonstration and dissemination of proven model components.

STATE IMPLEMENTATION grants are made to State Education Agencies to assist them in developing long-term, comprehensive, full service plans for the early education of young handicapped children within the state. Grant-supported activities may include the convening of state planning groups, disseminating statewide early education plans, developing early childhood program standards and guidelines, and promoting consortia of early childhood service providers in the state.

EARLY CHILDHOOD RESEARCH INSTITUTES are supported by contracts to conduct longitudinal studies in the areas of developmental aspects of the child, child assessment, intervention methods, and other areas. The four institutes are located at the University of California/Los Angeles, University of Kansas, University of North Carolina, and Educational Testing Service/Princeton with Roosevelt Hospital/New York.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S MODEL PROGRAM

The Handicapped Children's Model Program (HCMP) is also designed to demonstrate new or improved approaches to educating handicapped children. New grants support the development of traditional and nontraditional approaches to

intervention, considering the potential impact of the methodology and service delivery mode. Educational programs include the core academic areas as well as functional social skills. Eligible children are within the state-mandated ages for public services; HCMP is not limited to services for preschool children.

CENTERS FOR DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN

Deaf-Blind Centers provide specific programs to meet the needs of deaf-blind children and they coordinate with other agencies to provide these services: diagnosis and evaluation; education, adjustment, and orientation; and consultation for parents, teachers, and others directly involved with deaf-blind children. Additional activities include research, development, and demonstration of new or improved techniques with deaf-blind children, and inservice training of professional and allied personnel. Sixteen single- and multi-state Centers for Deaf-Blind Children are presently funded.

> For more information on the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, Handicapped Children's Model Program, and the Centers for Deaf-Blind Children, write to the Division of Innovation and Development, Office of Special Education, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Washington, DC 20202.

PRESCHOOL INCENTIVE GRANTS

Preschool Incentive Grants are awarded to states that apply based upon the number of handicapped children from 3 to 5 who are served in the state. The annual appropriation per child varies from year to year; this is a formula grant program. State Education Agencies may use the funds on a discretionary basis or may contract for services with Local Education Agencies, intermediate education agencies, or other agencies. The State Early Childhood Coordinator or State Director of Special Education within each state can provide information on the availability of these funds.

For more information on the Preschool Incentive Grant programs, write to the Division of Assistance to States, Office of Special Education, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Washington DC 20202.

DIVISIONS OF MEDIA SERVICES AND PERSONNEL PREPARATION

The Division of Media Services and the Division of Personnel Preparation (DMS & DPP) award grants to improve the quality and increase the supply of special educators and support personnel. Preservice and inservice training areas include early childhood education, parent involvement, the use of volunteers in the education of the handicapped, and transition of regular educators to special education. Local Education Agencies are among those eligible for grant assistance, along with universities, public service agencies, and others.

For more information, write to the Division of Media Services and the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Washington, DC 20202.

OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION AND BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education, the Office of Indian Education supports programs for Indian children, and the Indian Education Act (Title VI) of 1978 includes provisions for the education of exceptional children. OIE allocates three kinds of funds: formula grants to Local Education Agencies based on the number of Indian children in a school district; discretionary grants to Indian organizations, tribes, and institutions for demonstration programs; and fellowships to Indians in professional fields.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in the Department of Interior funds services for handicapped children ages 3 to 21 in federally recognized tribes. In states with permissive preschool legislation, 3- and 4-year-old handicapped Indian children can be enrolled in BIA schools until public schools can provide educational services. Weighting factors

are used to determine the amount of money available for each child. In addition to schools in 37 states, BIA operates five institutions for handicapped Indian children.

Information on these two programs can be obtained from the Office of Indian Education, Room 2177, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Washington, DC 20202 and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, 18th and C Streets N.W., Mail Code 507, Washington, DC 20245.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The Office of Bilingual Education funds a number of programs which teach English to non-English speaking children. English-dominant children also participate in the bilingual programs as models for the children learning English. OBE supports over 500 programs covering 72 language groups. Almost all states receive funds for demonstration programs which provide assistance in bilingual programming to local schools and community groups. Funding priorities for demonstration grants are those programs serving exceptional children and preschool children. Other programs supported by OBE include the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (with a toll free hotline: 1/800/336-4560); the National Network of Centers (a resource agency for bilingual programs); Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centers (which distribute information regarding bilingual education); and Materials Development Centers (which develop instructional materials in languages other than English).

For additional information, write to the Office of Bilingual Education, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Reporters Building, Room 421, Washington, DC 20202.

RESEARCHING AND APPROACHING POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

There are no magic formulas for building solid and continuous financial support for your program. Rather, maintenance of program services requires considerable time and creative effort by persons who are knowledgeable about and invested in the services provided to handicapped children and their families. Before seeking financial support, these basic steps should be planned for: (1) develop a "sales case" for presenting your program; (2) involve the community and other staff in both program development and fund-raising activities; (3) designate sufficient staff time, money, and materials to effectively carry out the necessary fund-raising activities; (4) formulate a timetable which reflects the program's needs and the time lag between request and receipt of funds; (5) identify a variety of potential funding sources which best match program needs; and (6) select solicitation methods appropriate for each funding source.

The funding request to any possible source needs these essential elements:

1. What is it that you are seeking support for? (the program, special project, research, service, etc.)
2. Why should these efforts be supported? (the community, state or national needs)
3. Who are the recipients of the services and who will be providing the services? (description of clients, and the staff and organizational qualifications)
4. Where are the program and clients located? (geographic impact area, organizational location, etc.)
5. When is the assistance needed? (considering the needs of the program and of the clients)
6. How much? (the total resources necessary and how much are you seeking from each source)

Researching potential funding sources in order to make a personalized request for funds will be an asset in the search for continuation monies. The following references represent a small sample of those available for pursuing financial support. Many of these publications are available from college or large public libraries. Also, many of the publishers/vendors will provide a free publications list or catalog at no charge.

Each reference is coded to the kind of information provided: federal government funding sources (FED), state

and local government sources (S/L), private foundations (PF), corporate and business contributions (C/B), and direct contributions from individuals (IND). The "other" (O) category covers other types of funding (e.g., contracts), how-to information, and organizations that provide funding information.

REFERENCES

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance
Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 ($20/year subscription)
*FED

Commerce Business Daily
Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 ($105/year subscription)
*FED

Federal Education Grants Directory
Capitol Publications, Inc., Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20037
*FED

Federal Grants and Contracts Weekly: Selected Project Opportunities for the Education Community
Capitol Publications, Inc., Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20037 ($114/year subscription)
*FED, O

Foundation Directory, Foundation Grants Index, Foundation Center National Data book, Foundation News, plus others
The Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10010 and The Foundation Center, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20036
*C/B, PF, O

Getting the Buck to Stop Here: A Guide to Federal Resources for Special Needs
The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091
*FED

Grants for the Child: 1980 Directory of Funds for Children and Youth

Public Management Institute, 333 Haynes Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 ($200)
*FED, C/B, PF

The Grantsmanship Center News and Reprint Series

The Grantsmanship Center, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90015
*FED, S/L, PF, C/B, IND, O

Handicapped Funding Directory

Research Grant Guides, P.O. Box 357, Oceanside, NY 11572 (1979-80 edition $16.50)
*FED, S/L, PF, O

How to Get Government Grants, America's Most Successful Fund-Raising Letters, How To Raise Funds from Foundations, The Complete Fund Raising Guide, plus others

Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10017
*FED, S/L, PF, C/B, IND, O

How to Raise Money for Kids (Public and Private)

Coalition for Children and Youth, 815 15th Street N.W., Washington, DC ($2)
*FED, PF, O

Proposal Writers Handbook, Understanding Grant-Making Foundations

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Suite 610E, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036
*FED, S/L, PF, O

Resources for Early Education Programs for Children with Handicaps

TADS, Suite 500, NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27514 (Available free to HCEEP Projects)
*FED, S/L, O

Special Report, Educating the Handicapped: Millions for Media, Training, and Personnel

National Audio-Visual Association, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, VA 22031
*FED

National Organizations: How to Get Involved

National professional organizations offer many opportunities for personal involvement and offer an effective vehicle for disseminating information about your program. Three such organizations, one dealing with the education of young children and the others with exceptional children, are discussed here.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has as its purpose to act on behalf of the needs and rights of children from birth to eight years. Founded in 1926, NAEYC has an international membership of over 33,000 and supports 235 local affiliate groups. Members are primarily teacher educators and teachers of children in Head Start, nursery school, child care, and other early childhood programs, but also administrators, elementary teachers, students, and social workers. NAEYC provides its members with educational services and resources, publications, and directions for child advocacy.

NAEYC's annual conference draws about 10,000 participants and offers over 200 sessions, many dealing with

---

Panel presenters for this session included Janet Brown from the National Association for the Education of Young Children, June Jordan from the Council for Exceptional Children, and Elouise Jackson of the CEC Division for Early Childhood.

minority concerns and special education, and over 100 exhibits. Special minority caucuses include Asian-American, Black, Chicano, Native American, Jewish, and male groups. Conference presenters are chosen from proposals submitted to NAEYC each January. Other NAEYC activities include state, regional, and local conferences and workshops; newsletters; the national Week of the Young Child; and distribution of public policy information.

The NAEYC professional journal, Young Children, is published six times a year. Articles relate to early childhood research and theory which translate to practice. Manuscripts submitted for publication are reviewed by NAEYC staff and then by some of 650 volunteer field reviewers. The review process generally takes from eight to twelve weeks, after which the author is notified of NAEYC's intent to publish. For those interested in submitting articles to Young Children, manuscript guidelines are available from NAEYC, 1629 21st Street N.W., Washington, DC 20009. NAEYC also purchases photographs of children for use on covers of Young Children.

Six books dealing with early childhood practices are also published each year. Persons interested in writing for NAEYC publication should first submit an outline for review. NAEYC does not publish position papers or state-of-the-art manuscripts.

COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

The Council for Exceptional Children was founded in 1922 at Teachers College, Columbia University, by twelve faculty and advanced degree students in special education. From that small group, this professional organization has grown to 63,000 members in the United States and Canada. The purpose of CEC is to continually work for improved instructional programs and related services for exceptional children, both gifted and handicapped. This challenge is accomplished through such activities as advocacy, legislation (federal and state), professional publications, conventions and conferences, information dissemination (the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children), special projects on current issues, and support of membership programs at state and local levels.

Many opportunities exist for involvement in CEC. Through local and state chapters and federations, your project can be brought to the attention of local school systems and community groups. Another area for involvement is that of the twelve special interest groups or divisions within

CEC. Each group collects its own dues, produces publications, and conducts its own professional program at the CEC Annual Convention. Some hold their own regional or topical conferences. These groups include the Division of Early Childhood (see next section), CEC-Mentally Retarded, the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, and the Division for the Visually Handicapped.

The CEC Annual Convention draws 11,000 to 13,000 participants and offers several hundred sessions and special events. Participation in the Convention program is an excellent way to disseminate your program. Information on when and how to prepare a program proposal is published in CEC journals and is available from the CEC Conventions Unit, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091. Special topical conferences are also scheduled around the country each year. As an example, upcoming conferences will be focusing on the exceptional Black child and the exceptional bilingual child.

CEC publishes two professional journals. Exceptional Children reports research, the state of the art, and current issues and trends. Teaching Exceptional Children, for the practitioner, contains articles on instructional materials, methods, and techniques. Although some manuscripts are invited, especially for special topical issues, most are unsolicited and are reviewed before acceptance. Guidelines for submitting articles are available from the CEC Publications Unit at the address above.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children is housed at CEC. This system provides for national distribution of project-developed materials--curricula, assessment measures, and instructional manuals. After review and processing, documents are made available to national dissemination systems in microfiche or paper copy.

A final vehicle for national involvement is of special interest, the minority caucuses. Organized minority participation in CEC began in the late '60s with the formation of the Black Caucus. Since then, other groups such as the Asian Caucus have been formed and minority participation in leadership positions has increased dramatically. Minorities are guaranteed two positions on the Board of Governors Executive Committee, assuring representation at the highest governing level of CEC. Minorities have served in the presidency of both the Foundation for Exceptional Children and the Council for Exceptional Children. An Office of Minority Concerns and Development was established in 1977 to provide minorities with a full-time ombudsperson on the CEC staff. Through this office, a Talent Bank Directory has been published and made available to public and private agencies seeking the services of minorities with particular areas of expertise. Additional information on minority involvement in CEC can be obtained from Philip Chinn at the CEC address.

CEC DIVISION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD

The Division for Early Childhood (DEC) within CEC was organized in 1973 in response to the growing interest in the education of young exceptional children and infants. The purposes of DEC are (1) to promote the education of all exceptional young children and infants, (2) to promote programs which cooperatively involve parents in their children's education, (3) to stimulate communication and joint activities among early childhood organizations, and (4) to disseminate information through publications, workshops, and professional meetings. Merle Karnes, University of Illinois, is the President during 1980-81.

Under the DEC constitution, an Executive Board represents the division to CEC. The Board meets with the DEC membership at its annual business meeting each year at the CEC convention. DEC has played a major role in the annual convention program, hosting presentations in areas such as parent involvement, training, interagency cooperation, early identification and programming, and working with minority populations. Proposals for the DEC presentations are submitted to CEC according to their guidelines.

DEC's official newsletter, Communicator, is published twice a year and contains information on the activities of the division and general activities in the field of early childhood/special education, minutes of the Executive Board Meetings and the annual business meeting. DEC also publishes an annual journal, Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, devoted to topics such as research implications for future planning in early childhood/special education. Information regarding the DEC Communicator are available from CEC, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091. Manuscripts are accepted from teachers, parents, researchers, scholars, and other professionals related to the field of early childhood/special education. Communicator is also available to nonmembers for a charge.

Part 3

Supplementary Information

Part 3 includes supplementary information regarding the Minority Leadership Consortium and the workshop itself—the agenda, names and addresses of workshop resource persons, and the workshop evaluation report.

Minority Leadership Consortium

Iakopo Taula'i
Samoa's Cooperative Early Education Model
State Education Agency of American Samoa
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

*Torcey Wiley
Infant/Family Education Project
Drew Postgraduate Medical School
12021 South Wilmington Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90059

*Tom Maes
Music-Oriented Intervention Program
Adams County School District #1
602 E. 64th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80229

Elaine Vowels, Conrad Brooks, John Reed
Handicapped Infant Intervention Project
DC General Hospital
Pediatrics Building
4th Floor, West Wing
1900 Massachusetts Avenue S.E.
Washington, DC 20003

Rosa Trapp-Dukes, Teresa Mueller, Norma Hall
IMPACT
Child Development Center
College of Medicine, Box 19
Howard University
Washington, DC 20008

Ann Palmore
DC Public Schools
Webster Building
10th & H Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Selerya Moore
National Child Day Care Association
1501 Benning Road N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

Etrulia Lee
Therapeutic-Educational Day Care for Infants
Hospital for Sick Children
1731 Bunker Hill Road N.E.
Washington, DC 20017

Alma Callaway
Demonstration Project for Preschool Handicapped Children
Fort Valley State College
P.O. Box 5483
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

* Minority Leadership Consortium Steering Committee Member

Setsu Furuno
Family-Centered Care
for High Risk Infants
Kapiolani Children's
Medical Center
Department of Pediatrics
1319 Punahou Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Marcia Johnson
Division of Special Education
State Dept. of Education
229 Statehouse
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Wilma Gaines
Ouachita Parish Program
Ouachita Parish School System
701 St. John
Monroe, Louisiana 71201

Edith Kong-Lam
Orleans Model for Preschool
Handicapped
New Orleans Public Schools
703 Carondelet Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Daphne Thomas
State Dept. of Education
Special Education Services
Capitol Station,
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Jane C. Birckhead
Baltimore Early Childhood
Learning Continuum
Div. of Exceptional Children
2300 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Correan Baker
Early Educational Intervention
and Responsible Parenting
Program
Childrens Guild, Inc.
5921 Smith Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21209

Fran Collins
Division of Special Education
State Dept. of Education
Early Childhood Project
31 St. James Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Beverly Johnson
Detroit's Preschool Pupil/Parent
Professional Readiness Project
Detroit City School District
Room 1010
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Phillip Martin
Development of Services
Model for Handicapped
Choctaw Children
Mississippi Band of Choctaw
Route 7, Box 21
Philadelphia, Mississippi
39350

Sandra Gautt
Early Intervention Program
University of Missouri
at Columbia
515 S. Sixth Street
Columbia, Missouri 65211

*Leonard Fitts
Project CREEP
Special Services Division
3rd and Walnut Streets
Camden, New Jersey 08103

Rhonda Chino
Acoma Early Intervention
Project
Pueblo of Acoma
P.O. Box 307
Acomita, New Mexico 87034

Vidal Perez
East Harlem Council for
Human Services
2253 Third Avenue, 3rd Floor
New York, New York 10035

*Yuki Okuma
Project MATCH ME!
East River Montessori School
577 Grand Street
New York, New York 10002

*Michael Ortiz
I Can/Will Do It Project
Appalachian State University
Edwin Duncan Hall
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Octavia Knight
North Carolina Consortium for Early Aid Demonstration of Model Comprehensive Services
N.C. Central University
Special Education Dept.
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Carolyn Perry
Division of Exceptional Children
Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Ann Barrick
Least Restrictive Environment for Handicapped Children
Stevens Administrative Center
Room B2
13th and Spring Garden
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

Awilda Torres
Dept. of Public Instruction
Programma Education Especial
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919

Rosemarie Gregory
Model/Demonstration Program for Preschool and Early Education of Handicapped Children
Project HELP
Route 1, Box 126
Harleyville, South Carolina
29448

Mary Cavazos, Pedro Grimaldo
Handicapped Early Childhood Assistance Project
Cameron Willacy Counties Community Projects, Inc.
940 E. Washington, Suite 204
Brownsville, Texas 78520

Yolanda Arellano
A PEPPY KIDS Project
Las Palmas YWCA
503 Castroville Road
San Antonio, Texas 78200

*Genoa McPhatter
CHICS Program
Chesapeake Public Schools
2107 East Liberty Street
Chesapeake, Virginia 23324

James Victor
Hampton Institute Mainstreaming Model
Special Education Program
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia 23668

Iselyne Hennessey
Department of Education
P.O. Box 630
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands
00801

Robert Diaz
Home-Based Preschool
c/o Ferndale High School
P.O. Box 428
Ferndale, Washington 98248

Minority Leadership Workshop Agenda

Monday, June 22	
8:30- 9:00a	Introductions and Workshop Overview Elouise Jackson, William Swan & Ed Wilson
9:00-10:15	What's Happening with the Minority Leadership Consortium - Leonard Fitts, Chairperson
10:30-11:45	Trends in Cultural Pluralism, followed by question/answer session - Jean Wofford
1:00- 2:30p	Developing, Implementing, & Disseminating the Educational Model, followed by strategy-generating sessions - Henry Hankerson
2:45- 4:15	Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies, followed by strategy-generating sessions - Yetta Galiber & Bruce Ramirez National Organizations, Publications, Conferences, & Meetings: How to Get Involved, followed by question/answer session - Janet Brown, June Jordan, Elouise Jackson
4:15 - 4:45	Reports on Strategies for Dealing with Model Program and Liaison Concerns
Tuesday, June 23	
8:45- 10:45a	Planning & Implementing Program Evaluation, followed by strategy-generating sessions - Patricia Gandara
11:00-12:00	Nondiscriminatory Assessment: Part 1 - Jean Wofford
1:00- 2:30p	Nondiscriminatory Assessment: Part 2 - Jean Wofford
2:30- 3:00	Strategy-generating sessions relating to assessment

3:15- 3:45	Reports on Strategies for Dealing with Evaluation/Assessment Concerns
3:45- 5:00	HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium Business Meeting - Leonard Fitts, Chairperson
8:00-10:00	HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium Business Meeting - Leonard Fitts, Chairperson

Wednesday, June 24

8:30-10:00	Problem Solving & Communication, followed by strategy-generating sessions - Bertram Coppock, Jr.
10:15-11:45	Working with Parents and Families - Aricita Theresa Brito Funding Sources, Federal Legislation, & OSE Programs - Ed Wilson, Charlie Miller, Hakim Khan, Charles Cordova, James Cox
11:45-12:30	Reports on Strategies for Dealing with Problem Solving/Communication and Parent/Family Involvement
1:00-	HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium Steering Committee Meeting

Minority Leadership Workshop: Resource Persons

Patricia Gandara
Associate Social Scientist
The Rand Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California 90406

Jean Wofford
Executive Officer
The Urban Institute
for Human Services, Inc.
1330 Gough Street
San Francisco, California 94109

Bertram Coppock, Jr.
Independent Consultant
7614 16th Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20012

Charles Cordova
Chief, Division for Exceptional Children
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Department of Interior
18th and C Streets N.W.
Washington, DC 20245

Henry Hankerson
Director, Undergraduate Teacher Education
Howard University
School of Education
Room 206
Washington, DC 20059

Yetta Galiber
Executive Director
Information Center for Handicapped Individuals
120 C Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Wilhelmina Taylor, Director
Louis Briganti, Associate
International Business Services, Inc.
1010 Vermont Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Janet Brown
Director, Publications
National Association for the Education of Young Children
1834 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Charlie Miller
Grants Chief, OBEMLA
400 Maryland Ave. S.W.
Reporters Bldg., Room 421
Washington, DC 20202

Hakim Khan
Director, Division of Special Projects
Office of Indian Education
400 Maryland Ave. S.W.
Room 2177
Washington, DC 20202

David Rostetter, Project Officer
for Program Development Branch
Ed Sontag, Acting Director of DMS
Bill Swan, Acting Chief for Program Development Branch
Ed Wilson, Project Officer for
Program Development Branch
Office of Special Education
3120 Donohoe Building
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
6th and D Street
Washington, DC 20202

Aricita Theresa Brito
Director, Adult Education
P.O. Box 7081
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104

Pat Trohanis, Director
Elouise Jackson, Technical
Assistance Coordinator for
SIGS
James Cox, Technical Assistance
Coordinator
TADS
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
27514

June Jordan
Editor-in-Chief
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

Bruce A. Ramirez
Specialist, Policy Implementation
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

Joan Karp, Associate Director
Joyce Jackson, Assistant Coordinator
WESTAR
215 University District Building
1107 N.E. 45th Street, JD-06
Seattle, Washington 98105

Minority Leadership Workshop: Evaluation Report

Fifteen of the 29 workshop participants completed the evaluation questionnaire at the close of the meeting. While it is difficult to make generalizations about the entire group's reaction to the meeting, the 15 respondents provided valuable feedback to the workshop organizers. Respondents rated the extent to which each workshop purpose was met and evaluated individual sessions for their usefulness. Open-ended questions were asked to assess strengths and weaknesses of the meeting. Additional comments concerning workshop location, organization, time, and accommodations were elicited. Respondents indicated the benefit they anticipate this meeting will have on themselves and their projects and offered suggestions for topics and issues to be addressed at future Minority Leadership Workshops. This report summarizes the responses concerning these workshop components.

PURPOSES OF THE WORKSHOP ACHIEVED

Participants rated the extent to which the purposes of the workshop were achieved on a 5-point scale, with 5 as the highest rating. Responses suggest that all workshop purposes were well achieved (see Table 1).

USEFULNESS OF SESSIONS

Sessions addressing 10 topics of interest were rated in terms of their usefulness or value for the participants. In

addition, the small group discussions, a large group reporting session, and the minority consortium meetings were also rated on their usefulness. Participants gave nearly all sessions a mean rating of 4.00 or above (Table 2). "What's Happening with the HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium" and "Awareness: Funding Sources, Federal Legislation and OSE Programs" received particularly high ratings. These data imply that all sessions included appropriate material for the participants.

TABLE 1

Extent to Which Workshop Purposes Were Achieved

Purpose	N	Mean
To continue to build and strengthen linkages among minority leaders within the HCEEP Network in order to examine the issues and problems faced in developing and implementing model programs for young exceptional children.	15	4.80
To develop a listing of recommended strategies for dealing with issues and problems minority leaders encounter as they develop and implement model programs.	15	4.53
To inform the HCEEP project minority leaders of the current status of the HCEEP Minority Consortium and other related activities.	15	4.80
To establish an organizational structure for continuing the HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium for fiscal year 1980-81.	15	4.80

TABLE 2

Usefulness of Sessions

Session Title	Responses	
	N	Mean
Monday, June 23		
-What's Happening with the HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium	15	4.73
-Trends in Cultural Pluralism	13	4.08
-Developing, Implementing, and Disseminating the Educational Model	14	4.43
Small Groups to Generate Recommended Strategies	12	4.25
-Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies	13	4.00
Small Groups to Generate Recommended Strategies	9	4.22
-National Organizations, Publications, Conferences, and Meetings: How to Get Involved	8	3.63
-Large Group Session: Reports on Strategies for Dealing with Model Program and Liaison Concerns	12	4.00
Tuesday, June 24		
-Planning and Implementing Program Evaluation	15	4.47
Small Groups to Generate Recommended Strategies	12	4.50
-Non-Discriminatory Assessment		
Part I	14	4.14
Part II	13	4.46
Small Groups to Generate Strategies to Deal with Assessment Concerns	11	4.18
-HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium Business Meeting	12	4.42
Wednesday, June 25		
-Problem Solving and Communication	10	4.00
Small Groups to Generate Recommended Strategies	9	4.00
-Working with Parents and Families	7	4.14
Small Groups to Generate Recommended Strategies	2	4.50
-Awareness: Funding Sources, Federal Legislation, and OSE Programs	7	4.57

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Participants were asked to comment on the overall quality, topics, and format of individual sessions. Four participants specifically commented on the session, "Planning and Implementing Program Evaluation," indicating that the presentation of difficult material was straightforward and practical. Participants also commented positively on the sessions, "Trends in Cultural Pluralism"; "Developing Implementing, and Disseminating the Educational Model"; Nondiscriminatory Assessment"; "HCEEP Minority Leadership Consortium Business Meeting"; and "Awareness: Funding Sources, Federal Legislation and OSE Programs." The comments about these sessions primarily indicated that the information provided was useful to the participants and that the sessions were relevant to the conference theme.

Many participants indicated that the opportunity to interact with other minority leaders was the most positive aspect of the workshop. A recurrent theme throughout the responses was the sharing of common experiences and the establishment of a network of minority leaders. Several participants saw the sessions devoted to generating strategies as an important step forward from last year's conference and found that the discussion of strategies provided valuable information.

The responses to a question about the weakest aspect of the workshop indicated that the participants felt more time should have been allocated to the small group strategy-generating sessions, so that the strategies could have been discussed more fully. Several comments indicated the session on trends in cultural pluralism, while presenting useful information on the topic, skirted the real issues.

Respondents indicated the topics and issues they want to have addressed at future Minority Leadership Workshops, including more information on the development of IEPs for minority children, the review of actual evaluation designs appropriate for measuring minority children's progress, other perspectives on nondiscriminatory assessment, assistance in grant writing, communicating multicultural sensitivity to majority educators, and looking at value systems and cultural differences and relating them to learning styles in a functional way.

Participants were asked to rate the benefit they anticipated the workshop would have on themselves and their projects in the future. Based upon 11 responses, the mean rating was 4.4 (5 indicated "of great benefit"), indicating that the participants predict that the information will have a great effect on their future endeavors.

Participants also provided feedback on workshop organization, hotel location and accommodations, and other issues related to the meeting. A few individuals expressed an interest in shorter presentations with more time for discussion and reflection. Several respondents indicated that greater use of visual aids would enliven the lengthier presentations. Respondents indicated that the meeting was well conducted and the accommodations were excellent.

In sum, the conference met the needs of the HCEEP minority leaders by providing presentations that were meaningful to their concerns and which were viewed as having lasting benefit in their program administration.